DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 151 HE 004 129

AUTHOR	Zawadski, Alfonso S.; Donny, William F.
TITLE	A Study of Student Housing at the Fourteen State-Owned Institutions.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	43p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *College Housing; *Dormitories; *Higher Education; Questionnaires; Research; Research Projects; Residential Colleges; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

To determine the present adequacy and future trends of the dormitory arrangements on each of Pennsylvania's 14 state-owned higher education institutions, a survey of administrators and students was conducted. The survey instrument, a four-part, 44-item student housing questionnaire, was developed and disseminated to the appropriate respondents at each campus location. Opinions of housing administrators and students are presented in discussion form and as responses to questionnaire items. Appendices include the response to the questionnaire by institutional administrators, a joint response by administrators and students, by students, and by officials. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076151

A Study of Student Housing at the Fourteen State-Owned Higher Education Institutions

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 129

Pennsylvania Department of Education 1972

ED 076151

A Study of Student Housing at the Fourteen State-Owned Institutions

This study has been a cooperative effort on the part of the Bureau of Educational Research and the Bureau of Institutional Development Services.

By Alfonso S. Zawadski
Research Assistant
and
William F. Donny
Research Associate
Division of Higher Education Research
Bureau of Educational Research
Pennsylvania Department of Education
July 1972

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Milton J. Shapp, Governor

Department of Education
John C. Pittenger, Secretary
Neal V. Musmanno, Deputy Secretary

Commissioner for Higher Education
Warren E. Ringler (Acting)

Bureau of Institutional Development Services
John H. McNally, Director

Bureau of Educational Research
Robert B. Hayes, Director

Division of Higher Education Research
Frank M. Durkee, Director

Pennsylvania Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Summary	v
Problem	1
Procedures	1
Discussion	2
Opinions of Housing Administrators	10
Student Opinions	11
Appendices	
1. Student Housing Questionnaire Response by Institution Administrators	14
2. Student Housing Questionnaire Joint Response by Institution Administrators and Students	17
3. Student Housing Questionnaire Response by Students	18
4. Student Housing Report A Summary	20
5. Student Housing Questionnaire Report by Officials (Responses to Item 6, Student Housing Report)	21
6. Letter of Transmittal of Questionnaires with Enclosures (Part I, Part II, Part III and Student Housing Report Form	26
7. Standard Room Use Categories	35

LIST OF TABLES

		Page No.
I.	Student Housing Questionnaire Response by Institution Administrators.	3
II.	Student Housing Questionnaire Joint Response by Institution Administrators and Students	6
III.	Student Housing Questionnaire Response by Students.	7
IV.	Student Housing Report A Summary	9

Summary

This survey of college housing officials and student residence hall representatives revealed housing practices, opinions and trends at Pennsylvania's 14 state-owned higher education institutions.

While only 2 of the 14 institutions have coeducational housing facilities, this survey demonstrates that a majority of representative administrators and students favor following the national trend toward establishing coeducational housing on or near each campus. The favored types of such housing are separate wings or separate floors preferably arranged like suites or apartments. Townhouses were also a favored housing design. In these facilities the students want comforts such as carpeting, individual telephone and TV cable connections and the privacy of individual baths and kitchens. Whether the students would be willing to pay more for such items is unknown.

The survey shows that 51 per cent of the student respondents thought present campus housing was adequate, but 56 per cent indicated a preference to live off-campus. One student comment, however, indicated that off-campus housing was overrated and overpriced.

While 87 per cent of the freshmen and 53 per cent of the upperclassmen live on campus, both administrators and students were of the opinion that all students should have more freedom of choice in this matter.

Survey results show that of the 116 public and private dormitories reported by the state-owned institutions, 38 were designed for male occupancy, 72 for female occupancy and 6 were termed coeducational facilities. Fifty-three of these dormitories are heated by steam, 44 by hot water, 19 utilize electric heat and 2 also have central air conditioning.

At the beginning of the 1971-72 academic year a total of 762 dormitory vacancies existed. Twenty-five per cent of all dormitory students reported in this study lived in private dormitories, one-half of which were under institutional control.

One of the interesting sidelights of this study is that more sophisticated educational and social goals might be attained by introducing more flexible and creative housing assignment practices supported by computer assistance. For instance, more roommate assignment criteria might be employed and more special student grouping arrangements might be attempted. Further research is needed in these areas.

The unanimity of agreement between administrators and students that new types of housing are needed seems paradoxical since the study revealed that many dormitories are essentially new or have been recently altered or improved.

A definition of terms, description and limitations of residential facilities appear in Appendix 7, Standard Room Use Categories.

A STUDY OF STUDENT HOUSING AT THE FOURTEEN STATE-OWNED HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Student unrest at the colleges and universities is sometimes associated with student dormitories. At some higher education institutions dormitories are 25 per cent empty.[1] In fact, there were 762 vacancies in the dormitories of the 14 state-owned higher education institutions in Pennsylvania at the beginning of the 1971-72 academic year.

One writer on student housing asserted:

> Until recently, no one had taken the trouble to find out what students really do want. The high-rise dormitories that proliferated in the last two decades were designed to provide shelter, sustenance and as many beds per square feet as possible.
>
> Little thought was given to the kinds of social environment these rabbit warrens create; little credence was given to the fact that buildings affect the way we feel and the way we live. Now that students have rejected these huge, "institutional" structures, hard-pressed housing authorities are beginning to listen to their tenants.[2]

Contrary to the national college housing scene, Pennsylvania has been giving thought and action to college housing and called for research to find out the status of present thinking and attitudes on this important matter.

Problem

At the request of the Bureau of Institutional Development, the Bureau of Educational Research recently conducted a survey of administrators and students in each of Pennsylvania's 14 state-owned higher education institutions to determine the present adequacy and future trends of the dormitory arrangements on each campus.

Procedures

In order to obtain information concerning these dormitory issues, a four-part student housing questionnaire was developed and disseminated to the appropriate respondents at each campus location. Although this 44-item questionnaire and its cover letter are reproduced in the appendix, a short description of the survey instrument is included here to orient the reader to its general contents.

---

[1] Tolmach, Judith. "How to Keep Them Happy Down in the Dorm," College Management, September 1971, p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 12.

Designated housing officials on each campus responded to the 15 items of Part I which related to housing assignment practices as well as to coeducational housing practices or plans. The four items of Part II dealing with prevailing types of student housing, housing costs and housing adequacy were completed by institutional housing officials and residence-hall student government representatives. Student attitudes toward dormitory conveniences, services and conditions affecting the quality of dormitory living were elicited by the 13 items of Part III. Student opinion concerning coeducational housing was also obtained. A fourth survey section briefly inventoried some of the physical properties of each public and private dormitory associated with the 14 campuses. Results from each of the four survey parts are summarized in condensed tabular form in the body of the study, and these results appear in complete detail in the appendix.

Discussion

Table 1 is a compilation of college housing administrators' responses. From their response pattern the following housing profile was built.

The institutions are using relatively few roommate assignment criteria. Academic ability as an example of such a criterion is used by only one college. Assignment programs are underused also. Only one college is attempting to group residential life by students' major fields of study. Greater assignment flexibility and creativity could be initiated if more institutions relied on data processing equipment. Only three institutions presently rely totally on data processing of residence hall assignments.

Two of Pennsylvania's state-owned higher learning centers now provide coeducational housing. Officials at the remaining 12 institutions would like to see coeducational living arrangements on their campuses. The favored coeducational arrangements were separate wings, separate floors or apartments. Universally rejected by housing officials were rooms for men and women on the same floor. Five campuses are presently considering policies of providing coeducational facilities.

Of the 14,709 freshmen accounted for by the study, 12,775 or 87 per cent were living on campus; of 33,526 upperclassmen, only 17,721 or 53 per cent lived on campus. Freshmen have less opportunity to request a specific room or roommate than do upperclassmen.

It is interesting to compare some results of Part I of this study (concerning room and roommate assignment programs) with the results of a study carried out in 1971 among 315 institutions by David A. DeCoster of Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. Eight of the Indiana survey items were adapted to the Pennsylvania survey instrument not only for their basic value, but also for purposes of comparison. These items are the first five in Table 1 plus items 7, 8 and 10. The responses to these items by Pennsylvania institutional housing officials closely parallel the response patterns in the larger study, except in one case. Item 8 indicates that 14 per cent (or 2) of Pennsylvania's state-owned institutions operate coeducational housing facilities, but the larger Indiana study reveals that 70 per cent of the 299 responding institutions operate such coeducational units.

Table I

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONSE BY INSTITUTION ADMINISTRATORS

Item	Institutional Responses		
	Yes	No	No Response
1. Do you consider the following variables when assigning students as roommates?			
a. Age	8	5	1
b. Year in college	11	3	0
c. Academic ability	1	13	0
d. Major field of study	7	6	1
e. Special interests, hobbies or activities	3	10	1
f. Personality characteristics	2	11	1
g. Living habits	3	10	1
h. Religious affiliation	0	13	1
i. Type of home community	3	10	1
j. Type of high school attended	2	11	1
k. Smoking	3	10	1
l. Geographic location of home	4	9	1
m. Other	1	0	13
2. Which students have the opportunity to request a room assignment preference in a specific hall?			
a. Freshmen	4	8	2
b. Upperclassmen	14	0	0
c. Graduates	5	4	5
d. None	0	0	14
3. Which students have the opportunity to request a room preference with a specific roommate?			
a. Freshmen	10	3	1
b. Upperclassmen	14	0	0
c. Graduates	6	3	5
d. None	0	0	14

Table I--contd.

Item	Institutional Responses: Yes	No	No Response
4. Please indicate which of the following special assignment programs you currently utilize in your residence halls.			
a. All freshmen living units	3	8	3
b. All upperclassmen living units	2	9	3
c. Some proportional representation of upperclassmen and lower classmen	11	3	0
d. All graduate living units	2	9	3
e. Some major field of study	1	10	3
f. All studying same language	1	10	3
g. Same special interests	1	10	3
h. Common classroom experience	1	10	3
i. Other	2	0	12
5. Do you use data processing equipment to assign students in residence halls?			
a. None	6	0	8
b. Partially	5	0	9
c. Totally	3	0	11
6. Would you like to see coeducational living on your campus			
a. In all the residence halls?	0	11	3
b. In only part of the residence halls?	13	1	0
7. Do you feel there should be coeducational housing facilities for your campus? (If yes, please answer "a" through "d.")	14	0	0
a. Separate wings for men and women located within the same building and having a common area for joint activities	10	3	1
b. Separate floors for men and women students located within the same building and having a common area for joint activities	10	1	3
c. Suites or apartments for men and women on the same floor within the same building	9	2	3
d. Rooms for men and women on the same floor within the same building	0	10	3

Table I--contd.

Item	Institutional Responses		
	Yes	No	No Response
8. Do you currently provide any type of coeducational facilities on your campus?	3	11	0
9. Are you considering adopting a policy to provide coeducational dormitory facilities on campus?	6	5	4
10. Are freshmen and upperclassmen usually assigned to the same living units?	12	2	0
11. Are any portions of the dormitories used for formal academic instruction?	4	10	0
12. Does the admissions officer indicate to housing authorities what number of new students require housing?	13	1	0
13. Do you think institutions should limit the number of resident students they admit on the basis of space provided by college-owned and local private dormitories?	12	2	0
14. Do you think that new incoming students, who would normally be required to reside on campus, should be allowed to live off campus?	5	9	0

TABLE I--contd., (Item 15)

Freshmen and Upperclassmen Living On Campus and Living Off Campus, Academic Year Beginning September, 1971

	Total	Percentage
Freshmen Living on Campus	12,775	87
Freshmen Living Off Campus	1,934	13
Upperclassmen Living On Campus	17,721	53
Upperclassmen Living Off Campus	15,805	47

Student dormitory representatives joined administrators in responding to the four items of Part II. Table 2 reveals that their responses were in virtual agreement on three out of the four items. Students agreed with administrators that neither freshmen nor sophomores should be required to live on campus; both thought housing costs were reasonable; both recommended change in housing design--to something like apartments, for instance, instead of double rooms. The item of disagreement concerned the adequacy of college housing: 51 per cent of the students thought it was adequate, but only 39 per cent of administrators thought so.

Table II

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

JOINT RESPONSE BY INSTITUTION
ADMINISTRATORS AND STUDENTS

			Administrators Total	Percentage	Students Total	Percentage
1.	Is college housing on the campus adequate?	YES	12	39	19	51
		NO	19	61	18	49
2.	Would you prefer that freshmen and sophomores be required to live on campus?	YES	11	34	6	12
		NO	21	66	43	88
3.	Are housing costs to students, in your opinion, reasonable?	YES	29	91	42	84
		NO	3	9	8	16
4.	Would you like to recommend changes in the type of accommodations (for example, apartments instead of double rooms)?	YES	30	97	42	86
		NO	1	3	7	14

Part III consists of 13 items to be completed by students only. This section of the questionnaire seeks to reveal the degree of students' acceptance of various features of dormitory life. Table 3 shows that students were critical mainly of the inadequate numbers and placements of telephones. The majority of student responses affirmed the adequacy of such items as dormitory counseling, lighting, furnishings and custodial services. The students generally approved the adoption or extension of coeducational housing, but they wanted an option of non-coeducational housing for students who oppose it. Paradoxically, in spite of generally approved dormitory conditions, 56 per cent of the students indicated that they would prefer to live off campus.

Table III

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONSE BY STUDENTS

			Total	Percentage
1.	Is dormitory counseling satisfactory?	YES	31	72
		NO	12	28
2.	Does current housing (dormitories, etc.) meet the students' interests and needs in living conditions, social and recreational desires?	YES	18	43
		NO	24	57
3.	Is lighting adequate for study?	YES	26	59
		NO	18	41
4.	Are electrical outlets adequate in number and placement?	YES	31	72
		NO	12	28
5.	Are numbers and locations of telephones adequate in each dormitory?	YES	14	33
		NO	29	67
6.	Do you feel there should be coeducational housing facilities for your campus? If yes, please answer "a" through "d."	YES	39	93
		NO	3	7
	a. Separate wings for men and women located within the same building and having a common area for joint activities.	YES	30	75
		NO	10	25
	b. Separate floors for men and women students located within the same building and having a common area for joint activities.	YES	26	67
		NO	13	33

Table III--contd.

		Total	Percentage
c.	Suites or apartments for men and women on the same floor within the same building.	YES 35 NO 4	90 10
d.	Rooms for men and women on the same floor within the same building.	YES 14 NO 25	36 64
7.	Would you like to see coeducational living on your campus		
a.	In all of the residence halls?	YES 6 NO 33	15 85
b.	In only part of the residence halls?	YES 33 NO 6	85 15
8.	Are dormitory regulations		
a.	Stern?	5	12
b.	Moderate?	36	86
c.	Nonexistent?	1	2
9.	How would you rate custodial services		
a.	Highly satisfactory?	9	21
b.	Satisfactory?	23	55
c.	Unsatisfactory?	10	24
10.	During regular sleeping hours, are dormitory sleeping areas		
a.	Quiet?	8	19
b.	Moderately Quiet?	31	72
c.	Noisy?	4	9
11.	Do guests visit dormitories		
a.	Frequently?	24	56
b.	Sometimes?	17	39
c.	Infrequently?	2	5

Table III--contd.

	Total	Percentage
12. Are furnishings provided by the institution		
a. Comfortable?	4	9
b. Adequate?	36	82
c. Uncomfortable?	4	9
13. In general, would students prefer to		
a. Live on campus?	19	44
b. Live off campus?	24	56

Table 4 summarizes the fourth or final section of the student housing questionnaire. This section inventoried certain aspects of each of the 116 public and private dormitories associated with the state-owned institutions. These dormitories were originally designed to house 30,314 students. Thirty-eight dormitories (33 per cent) were designed for male students, 72 dormitories (62 per cent) were built to accommodate female students and 6 dormitories (5 per cent) were termed coeducational facilities which now accommodate 2,117 students. Twenty-five per cent of all dormitory students (7,689) live in private dormitories, half of which are under institutional control. Significantly, perhaps, there were 762 dormitory vacancies at the beginning of the current year. The names of all Commonwealth and privately owned dormitories, indicating the last known year alterations or improvements were made, appear in Appendix 5, Table IV-B.

Table IV

STUDENT HOUSING REPORT

A SUMMARY

	Total
1. Number of dormitory vacancies at beginning of current year.	762
2. Number of male dormitories.	38
3. Total capacity of male dormitories as originally designed.	9,809
4. Average capacity of male dormitories as originally designed.	261
5. Average number of male students per floor.	65
6. Number of female dormitories.	72
7. Total capacity of female dormitories as originally designed.	18,388
8. Average capacity of female dormitories as originally designed.	271

9.	Average number of female students per floor.	66
10.	Number of coeducational dormitories.	6
11.	Total capacity of coeducational dormitories as originally designed.	2,117
12.	Average capacity of coeducational dormitories as originally designed.	301
13.	Average number of coeducational students per floor.	63
14.	Number of students in private off-campus dormitories:	
	a. Under institutional control.	4,052
	b. Not under institutional control.	3,637
15.	Average number of special rooms in all dormitories.	12
16.	Number of all dormitories which need more showers.	5
17.	Number of all dormitories which have inadequate toilet facilities.	4
18.	Type of heat in public and private dormitories:	
	a. Steam	53
	b. Hot Water	42
	c. Gas (hot water)	2
	d. Electricity	19
19.	Central air conditioning	2

Of these 116 dormitories 53 (46 per cent) are steam heated, 42 (36 per cent) are hot water heated and 21 (18 per cent) utilize electric heat. Two dormitories also have central air conditioning. Five dormitories (4 per cent) were reported as needing more showers and four dormitories (3 per cent) were noted as having inadequate toilet facilities. The average number of special rooms in all dormitories was 12.

Opinions of Housing Administrators

Administrators and students were encouraged in several parts of the student housing questionnaire to comment on student housing practices and plans. In Part I, for instance, housing administrators were asked to describe and comment on coeducational housing arrangements or plans for these on their campuses.

One housing officer responded that the existing types of dormitories do not lend themselves well to coeducational housing arrangements.

Another official indicated that on his campus two of the four coeducational housing facilities were designed as coeducational units and were privately constructed. Two state-owned dormitories, on the same campus, have been modified from single sex design to accommodate men and women on separate floors. The evaluation was that overall these arrangements were considered desirable, although there were social and structural problems associated with them.

A comment from another institution indicated that pilot summer session coeducational housing arrangements for graduate students were quite satisfactory and that plans to extend coeducational dormitory living to undergraduates are being made.

A comment from yet another institution stated that many types of housing should be provided: single rooms, suites, apartments and coeducational dormitories. This official commented further that if students are legal adults, they should be given the responsibility of adulthood which coeducational housing indicates.

A viewpoint from another institution is that all housing options should be available, including an option for students who do not desire coeducational experiences.

A dean of women wrote that coed housing has student support; it has a positive effect on behavior, language and dress; it aids in developing relaxed friendships; it emphasizes residence hall programming of a man/woman nature.

Arrangements at another institution seem to satisfy everyone: one arrangement is an alternate floor coeducational wing; the second is two towers connected by a common lounge.

Finally, one institution which has decided to implement a version of coeducational resident living and which endorses the idea that coeducational dormitories are unequivocally good, concludes with this statement: "We hope to be able to permit the students that live in this (coed) residence hall a certain amount of latitude in assuming responsibility for deciding how their lives will be spent."

Student Opinions

The fourth and final item of Part II of the student housing questionnaire was purposely open-ended to elicit recommendations for changes in the prevailing type of accommodations. Students responded to this invitation with a rich variety of suggestions.

Comments ranged from the idea that dormitory rooms are extremely adequate to the comment that dormitory living is outdated and not suited to "higher education." Another comment stressed that the state must provide suites, apartments, townhouses and carpeting or face competition with private housing. A contrasting comment was that off-campus housing is overrated and overpriced.

In present dormitory facilities students desire more comforts, conveniences and services. In their rooms they want more lounge furniture, individual bathrooms, individual telephones and TV cables. Some students think that all dormitories should have kitchens and washing and ironing rooms. Some students want more storage space, shelving, shoeracks and space for toilet articles. Also desired are more elaborate study areas, more soundproofing, air conditioning and carpeting in halls and lounges.

Some students envision fewer high-rise long corridor arrangements. There is sentiment in favor of apartments for those 21 and for married couples which students say would solve the 24-hour dormitory problem.

In response to item 5 of Part III concerning the adequacy of dormitory telephone service, 67 per cent of the responding residence hall student representatives indicated that the number and placement of telephones were inadequate. The consensus was that there were only one or two telephones per floor and they were often either in use or out of order. Students wanted more privacy while talking and suggested that a phone in each room was the best answer. One comment revealed that Bloomsburg will place a phone in each room in the men's dorms next year at a cost of $1.00 per week.

Other suggestions were for more pay phones, for a Wats line for students and for an improved intra or inside campus phone system.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

TABLE I-A

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONSE BY INSTITUTION ADMINISTRATORS

		Bloomsburg	California	Cheyney	Clarion	East Stroudsburg	Edinboro	Indiana	Kutztown	Lock Haven	Mansfield	Millersville	Shippensburg	Slippery Rock	West Chester	Total
1. Please check all of the following variables that you consider when assigning students as roommates who have not specifically requested to live together.																
a. Age	a. Yes	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1				8
	No						1	1	1				1		1	5
b. Year in college	b. Yes	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	11
	No						1	1	1							3
c. Academic ability	c. Yes	1														1
	No		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
d. Major field of study	d. Yes	1	1		1	1				1	1	1				7
	No			1			1	1	1				1		1	6
e. Special interests, hobbies or activities	e. Yes	1			1							1				3
	No		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	10
f. Personality characteristics	f. Yes				1							1				2
	No	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	11
g. Living habits	g. Yes				1	1						1				3
	No	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1		1		1	10
h. Religious affiliation	h. Yes															0
	No	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	13
i. Type of home community	i. Yes	1	1			1										3
	No			1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	10
j. Type of high school attended	j. Yes	1	1													2
	No			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	11
k. Smoking	k. Yes				1	1						1				3
	No	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1		1		1	10
l. Geographic location of home	l. Yes	1	1	1		1										4
	No				1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	9
m. Other	m. Yes								1*							1
	No															0
2. Which students have the opportunity to request a room assignment preference in a specific hall?																
a. Freshmen	a. Yes	1	1		1							1				4
	No					1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	8
b. Upperclassmen	b. Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14
	No															0
c. Graduates	c. Yes	1	1				1				1		1			5
	No				1			1				1			1	4
d. None	d. Yes															0
	No															0
3. Which students have the opportunity to request a room preference with a specific roommate?																
a. Freshmen	a. Yes	1	1		1	1				1	1	1	1	1	1	10
	No						1	1	1							3
b. Upperclassmen	b. Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14
	No															0
c. Graduates	c. Yes	1	1		1		1				1		1			6
	No							1				1			1	3
d. None	d. Yes															0
	No															0

TABLE I-A--contd.

		Bloomsburg	California	Cheyney	Clarion	East Stroudsburg	Edinboro	Indiana	Kutztown	Lock Haven	Mansfield	Millersville	Shippensburg	Slippery Rock	West Chester	Total
4. Please check all of the following special assignment programs that you are currently utilizing in your residence halls.																
a. All freshmen living units	a. Yes	1						1			1					3
	No		1		1	1			1	1		1	1		1	8
b. All upperclassmen living units	b. Yes							1			1					2
	No	1	1		1	1			1	1		1	1		1	9
c. Some proportional representation of upperclassmen and lower classmen	c. Yes	1	1	1		1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	11
	No				1			1	1							3
d. All graduate living units	d. Yes						1						1			2
	No	1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1			1	9
e. Same major field of study	e. Yes									1						1
	No	1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1	1		1	10
f. All studying same language	f. Yes														1	1
	No	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1			10
g. Same special interests	g. Yes										1					1
	No	1	1		1	1		1	1	1		1	1		1	10
h. Common classroom experience	h. Yes										1					1
	No	1	1		1	1		1	1	1		1	1		1	10
i. Other	i. Yes				1**					1***						2
	No															0
5. Do you use data processing equipment to assign students in residence halls?																
a. None	a. Yes		1			1			1		1		1		1	6
	No															0
b. Partially	b. Yes	1		1	1					1		1				5
	No															0
c. Totally	c. Yes						1	1						1		3
	No															0
6. Would you like to see coeducational living on your campus																
a. In all of the residence halls?	a. Yes															0
	No	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	11
b. In only part of the residence halls?	b. Yes	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
	No					1										1
7. Do you feel there should be coeducational housing facilities for your campus? (If yes, please answer a through d.)	Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14
	No															0
a. Separate wings for men and women located within the same building and having a common area for joint activities	a. Yes			1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	10
	No	1	1										1			3
b. Separate floors for men and women students located within the same building and have a common area for joint activities	b. Yes	1			1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	10
	No		1													1
c. Suites or apartments for men and women on the same floor within the same building	c. Yes		1		1	1		1		1	1	1	1		1	9
	No	1							1							2
d. Rooms for men and women on the same floor within the same building	d. Yes															0
	No	1	1		1			1	1	1	1	1	1		1	10
8. Do you currently provide any type of coeducational facilities on your campus?	Yes				1		1*				1					3
	No	1	1	1		1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	11
9. If you do not now provide coeducational dormitory facilities on campus, are you considering adopting such a policy?	Yes	1		1			1		1					1	1	6
	No		1					1	1		1	1				5

*Summer

TABLE I-A--contd.

		Bloomsburg	California	Cheyney	Clarion	East Stroudsburg	Edinboro	Indiana	Kutztown	Lock Haven	Mansfield	Millersville	Shippensburg	Slippery Rock	West Chester	Total
10. Are freshmen and upperclassmen usually assigned to the same living units?	Yes	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	12
	No			1							1					2
11. Are any portions of the dormitories used for formal academic instructional purposes?	Yes				1	1				1					1	4
	No	1	1	1			1	1	1		1	1	1	1		10
12. Does the admissions officer indicate to housing authorities what number of new students require housing?	Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		13
	No														1	1
13. Do you think that institutions should limit the number of resident students they admit on the basis of space provided by college-owned and local private dormitories?	Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		12
	No							1							1	2
14. Do you think that new incoming students, who would normally be required to reside on campus, should be allowed to live off campus?	Yes			1	1		1		1				1			5
	No	1	1			1		1		1	1	1		1	1	9

TABLE I-A--contd. (Item 15)

Freshmen and Upperclassmen Living On Campus and Living Off Campus, Academic Year Beginning September 1971

	Bloomsburg	California	Cheyney	Clarion	East Stroudsburg	Edinboro	Indiana	Kutztown	Lock Haven	Mansfield	Millersville	Shippensburg	Slippery Rock	West Chester	Total
Freshmen Living On Campus															
Number	978	700	307	728	497	1,411	1,818	766	500	600	814	1,310	1,346	1,000	12,775
Percentage	96	100	67	80	77	94	100	91	100	96	50	79	100	94	87
Freshmen Living Off Campus															
Number	45	-	149	186	150	92	-	75	-	25	800	347	-	65	1,934
Percentage	4	-	33	20	23	6	-	9	-	4	50	21	-	6	13
Upperclassmen Living on Campus															
Number	1,206	700	397	1,185	918	1,342	3,006	1,099	870	1,500	1,197	988	1,483	1,830	17,721
Percentage	50	100	25	45	45	46	67	62	65	60	50	50	43	62	53
Upperclassmen Living Off Campus															
Number	1,184	-	1,209	1,433	1,106	1,582	1,500	680	475	1,000	1,200	1,336	2,000	1,100	15,805
Percentage	50	-	75	55	55	54	33	38	35	40	50	50	57	38	47

* Date of application, random selection.

** Foreign, financially disadvantaged and sorority students are assigned under special college policy.

*** Summer trial.

APPENDIX 2

TABLE II-A

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

JOINT RESPONSE BY INSTITUTION
ADMINISTRATORS AND STUDENTS

		Bloomsburg		California		Cheyney		Clarion		East Stroudsburg		Edinboro		Indiana		Kutztown		Lock Haven		Mansfield		Millersville		Shippensburg		Slippery Rock		West Chester		Total	
		Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students	Administration	Students
1. Is college housing on the campus adequate?	Yes		2		2	1	4		3	4	5			2	3	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	2		12	19
	No	4	2	6	4		2	1		3	2	1	1	2	2					1			3				1	1	19	18
2. Would you prefer that freshmen and sophomores be required to live on campus?	Yes					1	1		1	3	1			4	1			1	1			1	1			1			11	6
	No	4	4	6	6		5	1	2	4	6	1	1	1	4	1	1		1	1	6			1	5	1	2		1	21	43
3. Are housing costs to students, in your opinion, reasonable?	Yes	4	3	6	6	1	3		3	7	6	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	5	1	2	1	1	29	42
	No		1				3	1			1			2	2				1										3	8
4. Would you like to recommend changes in the type of accommodations (for example, apartments instead of double rooms)?	Yes	4	3	6	4		5	1	2	7	6	1	1	4	5	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	30	42
	No		1		2	1	1		1		1			1											1					1	7

APPENDIX 3

TABLE III-A

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONSE BY STUDENTS

			Bloomsburg	California	Cheyney	Clarion	East Stroudsburg	Edinboro	Indiana	Kutztown	Lock Haven	Mansfield	Millersville	Shippensburg	Slippery Rock	West Chester	Total	Per Cent
1.	Is dormitory counseling satisfactory?	1. Yes	3	2	3	6	6	1	4		1		1	2	2		31	72
		No		2	1		1			1		4		2		1	12	28
2.	Does current housing, dormitories, etc., meet the students' interests and needs in living conditions, social and recreational desires?	2. Yes	2		1	4	5	1	2				1	2			18	43
		No	1	4	3	1	2		2	1	1	4		2	2	1	24	57
3.	Is lighting adequate for study?	3. Yes	2	4	4	1	4	1	2		1		1	3	2	1	26	59
		No	1			5	3		2	1	1	4		1			18	41
4.	Are electrical outlets adequate in number and placement?	4. Yes	2	4	4	4	4	1	4	1			1	3	2	1	31	72
		No	1			2	3				1	4		1			12	28
5.	Are the numbers and locations of telephones adequate in each dormitory?	5. Yes	2	1	2	2	2		4							1	14	33
		No	1	3	2	4	5	1		1	1	4	1	4	2		29	67
6.	Do you feel there should be coeducational housing facilities for your campus? If yes, please answer a through d.	6. Yes	3	4	4	5	6	1	3	1	1	4	1	3	2	1	39	93
		No				1			1					1			3	7
	a. Separate wings for men and women located within the same building and having a common area for joint activities.	6,a. Yes	2	3	3	5	4	1	1	1	1	4		2	2	1	30	75
		No	1	1	1	1	2		2				1	1			10	25
	b. Separate floors for men and women students located within the same building and have a common area for joint activities.	6,b. Yes		2	3	6	3		1	1	1	4		2	2	1	26	67
		No	3	2			3	1	2				1	1			13	33
	c. Suites or apartments for men and women on the same floor within the same building.	6,c. Yes	3	2	3	6	6		3	1	1	4		3	2	1	35	90
		No		2				1					1				4	10
	d. Rooms for men and women on the same floor within the same building.	6,d. Yes	3	1	1	2	1		2				1		2	1	14	36
		No		3	2	4	5	1	1	1	1	4		3			25	64
7.	Would you like to see coeducational living on your campus																	
	a. in all of the residence halls?	7,a. Yes	1		2	2				1							6	15
		No	2	4	2	3	6	1	3		1	4	1	3	2	1	33	85
	b. in only part of the residence halls?	7,b. Yes	2	4	2	3	6	1	3		1	4	1	3	2	1	33	85
		No	1		2	2				1							6	15
8.	Are dormitory regulations																	
	a. stern?	8,a.		1	1	1	1			1							5	12
	b. moderate?	8,b.		2	3	3	5	6	1	4		1	4	1	3	2	1	36	86
	c. nonexistent?	8,c.						1									1	2
9.	How would you rate custodial services?																	
	a. Highly satisfactory.	9,a.			3		1	1	1		1			1			9	21
	b. Satisfactory.	9,b.		2	1	2	3	4		2		1	4		2	2	23	55
	c. Unsatisfactory.	9,c.		1		2	2	2		2						1	10	24

TABLE III-A--contd.

		Bloomsburg	California	Cheyney	Clarion	East Stroudsburg	Edinboro	Indiana	Kutztown	Lock Haven	Mansfield	Millersville	Shippensburg	Slippery Rock	West Chester	Total	Per Cent
10. During regular sleeping hours are dormitory sleeping areas																	
a. quiet?	10,a.	1				3	1	2					1			8	19
b. moderately quiet?	10,b.	2	2	4	5	4		2	1		4	1	3	2	1	31	72
c. noisy?	10,c.		2		1					1						4	9
11. Do guests visit dormitories																	
a. frequently?	11,a.	1	3	3	5	2		2	1	1	4		1		1	24	56
b. sometimes?	11,b.	2			1	4	1	2		1		1	3	2		17	39
c. infrequently?	11,c.		1			1										2	5
12. Are furnishings provided by the institution																	
a. comfortable?	12,a.			2		2										4	9
b. adequate?	12,b.	3	3	2	4	5	1	4	1	1	4	1	4	2	1	36	82
c. uncomfortable?	12,c.		1		2					1						4	9
13. In general, would the students prefer to																	
a. live on campus?	13,a.	1		3	2	4			1	1	4	1	1		1	19	44
b. live off campus?	13,b.	2	4	1	4	3		4		1			3	2		24	56

APPENDIX 4

TABLE IV-A

STUDENT HOUSING REPORT

A SUMMARY

	Bloomsburg	California	Cheyney	Clarion	East Stroudsburg	Edinboro	Indiana	Kutztown	Lock Haven	Mansfield	Millersville	Shippensburg	Slippery Rock	West Chester	Total
1. Number of dormitory vacancies at beginning of current year.	6		175	91		46	239	46	103	7				97	762
2. Number of male dormitories.	2	3	2	1	3	2	6	3	3	3	3	6	1	2	38
3. Total capacity of male dormitories as originally designed.	904	637	510	116	454	826	1754	707	631	594	822	960	296	710	9809
4. Average capacity of male dormitories as originally designed.	452	212	255	116	151	413	292	235	210	198	274	235	296	355	261
5. Average number of male students per floor.	100	55	61	38	53	50	60	71	82	60	61	78	98	52	65
6. Number of female dormitories.	4	3	3	2	4	6	17	5	3	3	4	5	5	6	72
7. Total capacity of female dormitories as originally designed.	1207	737	816	687	1023	1480	3253	1216	810	891	1227	1399	1320	2322	18389
8. Average capacity of female dormitories as originally designed.	301	245	272	342	255	246	191	243	270	297	306	279	264	387	271
9. Average number of female students per floor.	66	63	57	83	53	49	56	49	73	71	69	83	74	69	66
10. Number of coeducational dormitories.				4						2					6
11. Total capacity of coeducational dormitories as originally designed.				1370						949					2319
12. Average capacity of coeducational dormitories as originally designed.				342						240					291
13. Average number of coeducational students per floor.				76						50					63
14. Number of students in private off-campus dormitories:															
a. Under institutional control.				725	96	454	1475		120	380		90	234		4052
b. Not under institutional control.		430			271	1890		280			833				3437
15. Average number of special rooms in dormitories.	10	12	12	13	14	27	9	18	11	6	10	14	7	11	12
16. Number of dormitories which need more showers.					1		2		2	1					5
17. Number of dormitories which have inadequate toilet facilities.					1		2			1					4
18. Type of heat in public and private dormitories:															
a. Steam	6	4	5		7	1	3		4	4		9	4		53
b. Hot water				6			18	8		2				8	42
c. Gas (hot water)							2								2
d. Electricity		2		1		7					9				19
19. Central air conditioning.								1			1				2

APPENDIX 5

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

REPORT BY OFFICIALS

Responses to Item 6, Student Housing Report

Question: Year building was last altered or improved?

Institution	Name or Designation of Dormitory	Response
Bloomsburg	Columbia	Constructed 1971
	Elwell	New building
	Luzerne	1968
	Montour	New building
	Northumberland	1958
	Schuylkill	New building
California	Binns Hall*	1963
	Clyde Hall*	1968
	Johnson Hall*	1949
	Longanecker*	1966
	McCloskey Hall*	1963
	Stanley Hall*	1969
Cheyney	King Hall	No response
	Robinson Hall	No response
	Truth Hall	No response
	Tubman Hall	No response
	Yarnall Hall	To be repaired in 1972
Clarion	Ballentine	1949
	Forest Manor*	1968
	Given	1958
	Montgomery*	1965
	Nair	1970
	Ralston	1962
	Wilkinson	1970
Edinboro	Centennial Hall	1971-72
	Dearborn	1971-72
	Earp Hall	1971-72
	Heather Hall	1971-72
	Reeder Hall	1971-72
	Rose Hall	1971-72
	Scranton Hall	1971-72
	Shafer Hall	1971-72

APPENDIX 5 (contd.)

Institution	Name or Designation of Dormitory	Response
East Stroudsburg	Hawthorn Hall	Painted 1972
	Hemlock Hall	1970
	Laurel Hall	Painted 1968
	Linden Hall	Painted 1969
	Minsi Hall	No response
	Monroe Hall	1965
	Shawnee Hall	No response
Indiana	Algonquin Hall*	1971
	Conestoga Hall*	1971
	Elkins Hall	Painted 1970
	Gordon Hall	1970
	Grant Hall*	1971
	John Sutton	First floor 1972
		Third floor rooms painted 1968
		Fourth floor minor alterations 1971
	Langham Hall	1959
	Lawrence Hall	No response
	Leininger Hall*	Annual maintenance
	Leroy Hall*	1970
	Mack Hall	1971-72
	McGregor Hall*	Annual maintenance
	Oakland Hall*	1970-71
	Rooney Hall*	1971
	Scranton Hall	No response
	Shafer Hall	1969
	Stewart Hall	No response
	Stone Manor*	1971
	Thomas Sutton Hall	No response
	Turnbull Hall	No response
	Wahr Hall	1959
	Whitmyre Hall	Painted 1970-71
	Wyoming Hall*	1970
Kutztown	Beck Hall	When opened 1965
	Berks Hall	Unknown
	Deatrick Hall	1971
	Johnson Hall	1969
	Lehigh Hall	Apartment painted 1971
	Old Main	None recently
	Rothermel Hall	No response
	Schuylkill Hall	Apartment painted 1971

APPENDIX 5 (contd.)

Institution	Name or Designation of Dormitory		Response
Lock Haven	High Hall		Constructed 1970
	McEntire Hall		Constructed 1969
	North Hall		Constructed 1968
	Russell Hall		Constructed 1950
	Smith Hall		Constructed 1958
	Woolridge Hall		Constructed 1964
Mansfield	Hemlock Hall		1965
	Hickory Hall*		1971
	Laurel A Hall)	combined unit	1970
	Laurel B Hall)		1970
	Maple A Hall		1968
	Maple B Hall		1970
	North Hall		First floor 1971
	Oak Hall*		1971
	Pinecrest Hall		1964
Millersville	Bard Hall		1972
	Burrowes Hall		1971
	Drehm Hall		1970
	Gilbert Hall		1971
	Hull Hall		When built in 1965
	Harbold Hall		1970
	Landis Hall		1962
	Lyle Hall		1970
	Tanger Hall		When built in 1967
Shippensburg	Harley Hall		Annual minor repairs
	Kieffer Hall		Annual minor repairs
	Lackhove Hall		1964
	McLean Hall		Annual minor repairs
	McCune Hall		Annual minor repairs
	Mowrey Hall		Opened 1971
	Naugle Hall		1971
	Old Main		Now under renovation
	Wright Hall		1968
Slippery Rock	Bard Hall		When built 1968
	Harner Hall		When built 1965
	Hi-Rise Hall		When built 1969
	North Hall		1971
	Patterson Hall		1971
	Rhoads Hall		When built 1962

APPENDIX 5 (contd.)

Institution	Name or Designation of Dormitory	Response
West Chester	Goshen Hall	1966
	Killinger Hall	1959
	McCarthy Hall	1961
	Ramsey Hall	1967
	Sanderson Hall	1970
	Schmidt Hall	1971
	Tyson Hall	1966
	Wayne Hall	1970

*Privately owned dormitory

APPENDIX 6

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BOX 911, HARRISBURG, PA. 17126

The Bureau of Institutional Development Services is in the process of studying student housing at the state-owned higher education institutions in the Commonwealth. The long-range intent of this study is to obtain information to assist with policies relating to housing assignments, dormitory planning considerations and possible approaches to any future housing expansion.

A three-part questionnaire, intended for completion by college administration personnel and residence hall student government representatives, will provide a framework for analysis of campus housing. A separate student housing report form is also enclosed which should be completed by your designated housing officials. It is, therefore, requested that the institutional representative coordinate the completion of the enclosed three-part questionnaire, including the student responses wherever indicated, and provide the information requested on the separate student housing report.

To assist us in the research analysis, we ask that you return the completed forms on or before May 1, 1972.

If there are any questions concerning these survey forms, please contact Dr. Frank M. Durkee or Mr. Alfonso S. Zawadski, Bureau of Educational Research, telephone (717) 787-7195.

Sincerely,

Warren E. Ringler
Acting Commissioner for Higher Education
Office of Higher Education

encls.

APPENDIX 6

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Department of Education
Bureau of Institutional Development Services
Box 911, Harrisburg, Pa. 17126

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire consists of three parts. Part I is to be completed by college or university officials responsible for housing assignments or housing administration. Part II responses should be made jointly by designated institution officials and residence hall student government representatives. Part III should be completed exclusively by residence hall student government representatives.

All parts of the questionnaire are concerned with college and university policies and observations regarding student accommodations at state-owned higher education institutions. The collected data will be an important segment of a study conducted by the Bureau of Institutional Development Services in cooperation with the Bureau of Educational Research. Some of the findings will be compared with those developed in a national survey regarding college housing. Portions of the questionnaire relate to administrative and student attitudes, and other residence characteristics which may affect future planning in Commonwealth higher education institutions.

It is also hoped that the responses will provide sufficient data on which to determine the adequacy and quality of student housing from student and administration perspectives. More extensive research may result from this initial inquiry. Findings of the study will be made available to the participating institutions.

Questions may be answered by a check mark in the response columns or box. THE THREE PARTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ARE TO BE RETURNED TO:

Dr. Frank M. Durkee, Director
Division of Higher Education Research
Bureau of Educational Research
Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126

APPENDIX 6
(continued)

INSTITUTION REPORT COORDINATED AND SUBMITTED BY:

_____
(Name and Title)

_____
(College/University)

_____
(Telephone & Extension Number)

_____
(Date)

PART I

REPORT BY INSTITUTION ADMINISTRATION

This part of the Student Housing Questionnaire is to be completed by administrative officials responsible for housing assignments or housing administration.

	Yes	No
1. Does the admissions officer indicate to housing authorities what number of new students require housing?	____	____
2. Do you think that institutions should limit the number of resident students they admit on the basis of space provided by college-owned and local private dormitories?	____	____
3. Do you think that new incoming students, who would normally be required to reside on campus should be allowed to live off campus?	____	____
4. Please check all of the following variables that you consider when assigning students as roommates who have not specifically requested to live together.		
a. Age	____	____
b. Year in college	____	____
c. Academic ability	____	____
d. Major field of study	____	____
e. Special interests, hobbies or activities	____	____
f. Personality characteristics	____	____
g. Living habits	____	____

APPENDIX 6
(continued)

PART I

	Yes	No
4. (continued)		
h. Religious affiliation	____	____
i. Type of home community	____	____
j. Type of high school attended	____	____
k. Smoking	____	____
l. Geographic location of home	____	____
m. Other (specify)	____	____
5. Which students have the opportunity to request a room assignment preference in a specific hall?		
a. Freshmen	____	____
b. Upperclassmen	____	____
c. Graduates	____	____
d. None	____	____
6. Which students have the opportunity to request a room preference with a specific roommate?		
a. Freshmen	____	____
b. Upperclassmen	____	____
c. Graduates	____	____
d. None	____	____
7. Are freshmen and upperclassmen usually assigned to the same living units?	____	____
8. Please check all of the following special assignment programs that you are currently utilizing in your residence halls.		
a. All Freshmen Living Units	____	____
b. All Upperclassmen Living Units	____	____
c. Some proportional representation of Upperclassmen and Lower Classmen	____	____
d. All Graduate Living Units	____	____
e. Same Major Field of Study	____	____
f. All Studying Same Language	____	____
g. Same Special Interests	____	____

PART I

	Yes	No
8. (continued)		
h. Common Classroom Experience	____	____
i. Other (Specify)	____	____
9. Do you currently provide any type of coeducational facilities on your campus? (If your answer to this question is yes, please comment on the reverse side as to type of facilities provided, your reactions concerning desirability of such facilities, and other statements you feel to be relevant.)	____	____
10. If you do not now provide coeducational dormitory facilities on campus, are you considering adopting such a policy? (Please comment on reverse side, briefly giving your reasons for or against this consideration.)	____	____
11. Do you feel there should be coeducational housing facilities for your campus? (If yes, please answer a. through d.)	____	____
a. Separate wings for men and women located within the same building and having a common area for joint activities	____	____
b. Separate floors for men and women students located within the same building and have a common area for joint activities.	____	____
c. Suites or apartments for men and women on the same floor within the same building.	____	____
d. Rooms for men and women on the same floor within the same building.	____	____
12. Would you like to see coeducational living on your campus		
a. in all of the residence halls?	____	____
b. in only part of the residence halls?	____	____
13. Do you use data processing equipment to assign students in residence halls? (Please check one)		
a. None ____		
b. Partially ____		
c. Totally ____		
14. Are any portions of the dormitories used for formal academic instructional purposes?	____	____

APPENDIX 6
(continued)
PART I

15. Please indicate the number of freshmen and upperclassmen living on or off campus as of September 1971.

a. Number of Freshmen living on campus? _____

b. Number of Freshmen living off campus? _____

c. Number of Upperclassmen living on campus? _____

d. Number of Upperclassmen living off campus? _____

APPENDIX 6

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART II

JOINT REPORT BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION AND STUDENTS

Institution _____

Signed by _____

Date Questionnaire Completed _____

Responses to these questions are to be made on separate forms by designated institution officials and residence hall student government representatives. The student representative should consult with and try to represent his constituency in his responses. Completed forms are to be returned to the institution's Vice-President of Student Affairs or other person designated to collect student housing information at the college or university.

	Administration Response		Student Response	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Is college housing on the campus adequate?	____	____	____	____
2. Would you prefer that freshmen and sophomores be required to live on campus?	____	____	____	____
3. Are housing costs to students, in your opinion, reasonable?	____	____	____	____
4. Would you like to recommend changes in the type of accommodations (for example, apartments instead of double rooms)? Please comment on reverse side.	____	____	____	____

APPENDIX 6

STUDENT HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

PART III

REPORT BY THE STUDENTS

Institution_____

Signed by _____

Date Questionnaire Completed_____

Responses to these questions should be made by resident hall student government representatives. Completed forms are to be returned to the institution's Vice-President of Student Affairs or other person designated to collect student housing information at the college or university.

	Yes	No
1. Is dormitory counseling satisfactory?	____	____
2. Does current housing, dormitories, etc. meet the student's interests and needs in living conditions, social and recreational desires?	____	____
3. Is lighting adequate for study?	____	____
4. Are electrical outlets adequate in number and placement?	____	____
5. Are the numbers and locations of telephones adequate in each dormitory? Please comment on reverse side.	____	____
6. Do you feel there should be coeducational housing facilities for your campus? If yes, please answer a. through d.	____	____
a. Separate wings for men and women located within the same building and having a common area for joint activities.	____	____
b. Separate floors for men and women students located within the same building and have a common area for joint activities.	____	____
c. Suites or apartments for men and women on the same floor within the same building.	____	____
d. Rooms for men and women on the same floor within the same building.	____	____

APPENDIX 6

PART III
(continued)

7. Would you like to see coeducational living on your campus

	Yes	No
a. in all of the residence halls?	____	____
b. in only part of the residence halls?	____	____

8. Are dormitory regulations

☐ Nonexistent ☐ Stern ☐ Moderate

9. How would you rate custodial services

☐ Highly Satisfactory ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory

10. During regular sleeping hours are dormitory sleeping areas

☐ Quiet ☐ Moderately Quiet ☐ Noisy

11. Do guests visit the dormitories

☐ Frequently ☐ Sometimes ☐ Infrequently

12. Are furnishings provided by the institution

☐ Comfortable ☐ Adequate ☐ Uncomfortable

13. In general, would the students prefer to

☐ Live on campus ☐ Live off campus

APPENDIX 6

STUDENT HOUSING REPORT
(Use One Page For Each Building)

1. Institution Name:	2. Name or Designation of Dormitory:	3. Report Submitted By: Telephone & Extension Number:	4. Inventory Date:
5. Type: (Check One) Male Dormitory ____ Female Dormitory ____ Coeducational Dormitory ____	6. Year Building Was Last Altered or Improved:	7. Central Air Conditioning? (Check One) Yes ____ No ____	8. Kind of Heat Furnished:
9. Number of Occupants for Which Building is Designed:	10. Average Number of Students Per Floor:	11. Number of Vacancies at Beginning of Current Year:	12. Toilet Facilities Adequate? (Check One) Yes ____ No ____
13. Number of Showers Adequate? (Check One) Yes ____ No ____	14. Number of Special Rooms: Office ____ Student Laundry ____ Other (Specify)____ Guest ____ Laundry Pickup ____ Counselor ____ Luggage Storage ____		Other (Specify)____

15. Comments or Further Additional Description of the Dormitory:

SPECIAL ITEM TO BE COMPLETED ON ONE STUDENT HOUSING REPORT ONLY

16. Number of Students Residing in Privately-Owned Off-Campus Dormitories, other than private residences, UNDER INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL ____

17. Number of Students Residing in Privately-Owned Off-Campus Dormitories, other than private residences, NOT UNDER INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL ____

COMPLETED FORMS ARE TO BE RETURNED TO: Dr. Frank M. Durkee, Director
Division of Higher Education Research
Bureau of Educational Research
Department of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126

APPENDIX 7

STANDARD ROOM USE CATEGORIES

The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) in a review draft of a Higher Education Facilities Inventory and Classification Manual proposes these standard categories for college residential facilities, page 73ff.

900 RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

910 Individual Sleep/Study

Definition: One or more residential rooms for individual persons, typically furnished with bed(s), wardrobe(s), desk(s), and chair(s), plus associated bath and service areas.

Description: This category includes single or multiple sleep/study facilities. A sleep/study facility may be a room for combined sleep/study, a room exclusively for sleeping, or a room for living/study.

Limitations: Study rooms for general use, available and open to the dorm residents at large, and not part of bedroom or sleeping room suites, should be classified as study (410). Residential quarters equipped with cooking facilities are to be coded under the appropriate housekeeping facilities category (920).

911 Sleep/Study without Toilet/Bath

Definition: A sleep/study facility (of one or more rooms) without a connected bath.

912 Toilet/Bath

Definition: A toilet and/or bathroom intended to be used by only the occupants of residential facilities rather than the general public.

Description: This category includes common or shared bathroom facilities which may consist of full or half-baths, showers, or toilet and shower combinations, used expressly for the hall residents, and accessible from a corridor or general circulation area.

Limitations: This category does not include public rest rooms. Bathrooms internal to a sleep/study room (913), apartment (923), or house (921) are included in those respective categories.

913 Sleep/Study with Toilet/Bath

Definition: A sleep/study facility of one or more rooms with a connected bath.

913 Description: A sleep/study facility with bath facilities integrated to the suite and not separately coded as 912.

914 Sleep/Study Service

Definition: A room (or group of rooms) which directly serve the occupants of an individual sleep/study facility (910).

Description: This category includes mail rooms, laundry and pressing rooms, linen closets, maid rooms, serving rooms, trunk storage rooms, and telephone rooms which serve the occupants of individual sleep/study facilities (910, 911, 912, 913 above).

Limitations: This category does not include food facilities (see 630), central laundry (see 760), or central food stores (see 750), toilet/bath (see 912), lounge facilities (see 650), recreation or activity areas (see 670, 675), or non-assignable building service and utility areas.

920 Housekeeping

Definition: A complete living unit.

Description: This is the basic module or group of rooms designed as a complete housekeeping unit, i.e., contains bedroom(s), living room(s), kitchen and toilet facilities. It is not intended that individual rooms be specifically identified within the structure but only that the total interior areas be accounted for and reconciled.

921 House

Definition: A complete housekeeping facility that is a separate structure.

Description: This category includes houses provided for faculty, staff, or students.

922 House Service

Definition: A room or area that directly serves a house as an extension of the activities in such a facility.

923 Apartment

Definition: A complete housekeeping facility that is not a separate structure.

Description: This category includes apartments provided for faculty, staff, or students. Apartments need not necessarily be located in a residential facility.

924 Apartment Service

Definition: A room or area that directly serves an apartment or group of apartments as an extension of the activities in such a facility.

000 UNCLASSIFIED FACILITIES

050 Inactive Area

Definition: Rooms that are available for assignment to an organizational unit or activity but are unassigned at the time of the inventory.

Limitations: Rooms that are being modified or are not completed at the time of the inventory are so classified (060 or 070).

060 Alteration or Conversion Area

Definition: Rooms that are temporarily out of use because they are being altered, remodeled or rehabilitated at the time of the inventory.

Limitations: Rooms that are unassigned or are not completed at the time of the inventory are so classified (050 or 070).

070 Unfinished Area

Definition: All potentially assignable areas in new buildings or additions to existing buildings that are not completely finished at the time of the inventory.

Limitations: This category is intended only for the unfinished part of building or addition. The remaining parts of such buildings that are in use should be classified elsewhere.